



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,966	03/19/2001	Stephane Herman Maes	YOR9-2000-794US1 (8728-46)	9282
22150	7590	11/18/2005	EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			REFAI, RAMSEY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/811,966	Applicant(s) MAES ET AL.	
	Examiner Ramsey Refai	Art Unit 2152	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Responsive to Amendment received August 19, 2005.

Claims 1-42 are pending for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terms "relevant" and "non-relevant" in claims 4, 5, 11, 12, and 35 are relative terms, which render the claims indefinite. The terms "relevant" or "non-relevant" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-9, 11, 13-20, 22-35, 37, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tso et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625)

6. As per claim 1, Tso et al teach a network environment that includes a plurality of nodes and that uses a markup language to create documents, a method for filtering the documents, comprising the steps of:

upon receiving a request from a requesting node among the plurality of nodes (**Figures 4 and 8, element 100, column 5, lines 56-58, and column 9, lines 3-7**),

constructing an input Document Object Model (DOM) based on a document corresponding to the request (**column 8, lines 59-65, column 6, lines 22-45, column 11, lines 6-16; and column 12, lines 20-45; Documents are scaled to a model according predetermined characteristics. Subsequent requests will be rendered in accordance with the set model**),

storing the input DOM (**column 6, lines 46-53, column 8, lines 59-65, and column 16, lines 55-57**);

identifying elements of the input DOM that have previously been stored (**Figures 8-10, column 9, lines 3-12, column 10, lines 45-59, and column 15, lines 1-30; determines if webpage or a hypertext object of a webpage already stored**) and

filtering the input DOM to obtain a filtered DOM, based on at least one pre-specified rule being applied to the input DOM (**column 6, lines 23-52, column 19, lines 44-59, and column 4, lines 17-50**).

7. As per claim 2, Tso et al teach a method comprising the step of sending the filtered DOM to the requesting node (**column 8, lines 5-15, column 12, lines 20-45 and abstract**).

8. As per claim 3, Tso et al teach a method wherein said filtering step filters out previously received content from the filtered DOM based upon the identified elements (**column 19, lines 44-59, column 6, lines 23-52, and column 4, lines 17-50**).

9. As per claim 4, Tso et al teach a method wherein said filtering step filters out non-relevant content from the filtered DOM with respect to at least one of the request and at least one previous request (**column 12, lines 20-45, column 13, lines 1-21, and column 6, lines 23-52**).

10. As per claim 5, Tso et al teach a method wherein said filtering step comprises the step of identifying at least one of relevant content and the non-relevant content with respect to the identified elements (**column 19, lines 40-59, column 9, lines 3-12, column 10, lines 45-59, and column 15, lines 1-30**).

11. As per claim 6, Tso et al teach a method wherein the step of identifying changed data with respect to at least two interactions between the requesting node and another node from among the plurality of nodes (**abstract, column 9, lines 3-12, column 10, lines 45-59, and column 15, lines 1-30**).

12. As per claim 7, Tso et al teach a method wherein said filtering step comprises the step of including only the changed data in the filtered DOM (**column 15, lines 31-65, column 17, line 55-column 18, line 20 and column 15, lines 1-30**).

13. As per claim 8, Tso et al teach a method wherein the at least one pre-specified rule comprises removing previously received content from the input DOM, when at least one client device has at least one pre-specified limited resource (**column 4, lines 17-50 and column 6, lines 27-45**).

14. As per claim 9, Tso et al teach a method wherein the at least one pre-specified limited resource comprises at least one of a bandwidth, a memory capacity, a processing ability, and a display screen area, less than a pre-defined threshold (**column 4, lines 17-50 and column 6, lines 27-45**).

15. As per claim 11, Tso et al teach a method wherein at least one pre-specified rule comprises removing non-relevant content from the input DOM when the at least one client device has at least one pre-specified limited resource (**column 4, lines 17-50 and column 6, lines 27-45**).

16. As per claim 13, Tso et al teach a method comprising the step of inserting a first identifier in the filtered DOM to indicate a filtered status (**column 8, lines 55 –67 and column 10,lines 60-67**).

17. As per claims 14 and 17, Tso et al teach inserting a second identifier in the filtered DOM to indicate a source document from which the filtered DOM originated wherein the second identifier is a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (**column 15, lines 30 –65 and column 17, line 55-column 18, line 20**).

18. As per claim 15, Tso et al teach identifiers are comprised in a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) extension header (**column 10, lines 60-67**).

19. As per claim 16, Tso et al teach the use of Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) (**column 3, lines 45-60 and column 1, lines 42-60; WAP is well known to be used in mobile devices**).

20. As per claim 18, Tso et al teach method wherein; filtering step comprises the step of removing presentational markup from DOM (**column 6, lines 27-45 and column 19, lines 40-59**).

21. As per claim 19, Tso et al teach a method wherein said storing step stores the input DOM in a cache, and said identifying step identifies the elements of the input DOM that have previously been cached (**column 6, lines 46-53, column 8, lines 59-65, and column 16, lines 55-57**).

22. As per claim 20, Tso et al teach a method implemented by a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform said method steps (**abstract, column 14, lines 5-15, and column 22, lines 56-67.**

23. As per claim 22, Tso et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes a client device, and the requesting node is the client device (**Figures 4 and 8, column 15, lines 1-30, and column 2, line 49-column 3, line 13).**

24. As per claim 23, Tso et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device, at least one server, and at least one intermediary coupled there between, and the requesting node is an intermediary (**Figures 4 and 8, column 15, lines 1-30, and column 2, line 49-column 3, line 13)**

25. As per claim 24, Tso et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device and at least one server, the requesting node is a client device and the other node is the at least one server (**Figures 4 and 8, column 15, lines 1-30, and column 2, line 49-column 3, line 13)**

26. As per claim 25, Tso et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device, at least one server and at least one intermediary coupled there between, the requesting node is a client device



or an intermediary and the other node is a server or another intermediary (**Figures 4 and 8, column 15, lines 1-30, and column 2, line 49-column 3, line 13**)

27. As per claim 26, Tso et al teach a client/server environment and the plurality of nodes includes a client device and said filtering step is performed by the client device (**column 13, line 51-column 14, line 4**).

28. As per claim 27, Tso et al teach a method wherein the network environment is a client/server environment, the plurality of nodes includes at least one client device, at least one server and at least one intermediary coupled there between, and said filtering step is performed by the at least one intermediary (**Figures 4 and 8, column 15, lines 1-30, and column 2, line 49-column 3, line 13**).

29. As per claim 28, Tso et al teach a system for filtering markup language documents in a client/server environment having at least one client device and at least one server, said system comprising:

an intermediary operatively coupled between the at least one client device and the at least one server, adapted to receive a request sent from the at least one client device or from another intermediary, and to receive a document corresponding to the request (**Figures 4, 5, 7, column 15, lines 1-30, column 9, lines 46-60**)

a filter operatively coupled to said intermediary, adapted to build an input document object model (DOM) based on the document and filter the input DOM to output a filtered DOM

based on at least one pre-specified rule being applied to the input DOM (**Figures 2, 4, and 8, column 6, lines 23-52, column 19, lines 44-59, and column 4, lines 17-50**); and

a differential DOM coder operatively coupled to at least one client device and the intermediary, adapted to receive the filtered DOM and to identify and output at least changed data with respect to the input DOM and the filtered DOM (**Figures 4 and 5, and column 13, line 50-column 14, line 15**) .

30. As per claim 29, Tso et al teach a system for filtering markup language documents in a client/server environment having at least one client device and at least one server, said system comprising:

an intermediary operatively coupled between the at least one client device and the at least one server, adapted to receive a request from the at least one client device or another intermediary, receive a document corresponding to the request (**Figures 4, 5, and 7, column 15, lines 1-30, column 9, lines 46-60**) and to output a filtered document object model (DOM) to the at least one client device or the other intermediary (**column 6, lines 23-52, column 19, lines 44-59, and column 4, lines 17-50**) ;

a storage device operatively coupled to said intermediary, adapted to store an input DOM (**Figures, 4, 5, 7 and column 8, lines 56-65; cache memory**), and identify elements of the input DOM that have previously been stored (**Figures 8-10, column 9, lines 3-12, column 10, lines 45-59, and column 15, lines 1-30; determines if webpage or a hypertext object of a webpage already stored**) and

a filter operatively coupled to said storage device and said intermediary or the other intermediary, adapted to build the input DOM based on the document (**column 8, lines 59-65,**

**column 6, lines 22-45, column 11, lines 6-16; and column 12, lines 20-45; Documents are scaled to a model according predetermined characteristics. Subsequent requests will be rendered in accordance with the set model), and filter the input DOM to obtain the filtered DOM based on at least one pre-specified rule being applied to at least one of the input DOM and the identified elements (column 19, lines 40-59, column 4, lines 17-50 and column 6, lines 27-45).**

31. As per claim 30, Tso et al teach a system wherein at least one of said storage device and said filter is disposed within said intermediary, the other intermediary, or a combination thereof **(Figures 5 and 7).**

32. As per claim 31, Tso et al teach a system wherein said storage device is further adapted to track a history of user interaction **(column 10, lines 11-36).**

33. As per claim 32, Tso et al teach a system wherein the history of user interaction comprises a World Wide Web (WWW) page visited during a given interactive session **(column 10, lines 11-36 and column 1, lines 13-21).**

34. As per claim 33, Tso et al teach a system wherein said storage device is a cache **(Figures 4, 5, and 7).**

35. As per claim 34, Tso et teach a system wherein said filter is adapted to filter the input DOM so as to remove previously received content therefrom (**Figures 8-10, column 9, lines 3-12, column 10, lines 45-59, and column 15, lines 1-30; determines if webpage or a hypertext object of a webpage already stored**)

36. As per claim 35, Tso et al teach a system wherein said filter is adapted to filter the input DOM so as to remove non-relevant content therefrom with respect to at least one of the request and at least one previous request (**column 12, lines 20-45, column 13, lines 1-21, and column 6, lines 23-52**).

37. As per claim 37, Tso et al teach a system wherein said filter is adapted to filter the input DOM one of prior to, during, and after transcoding at least one page corresponding to the input DOM (**column 6, lines 23-52, column 19, lines 44-59, and column 4, lines 17-50**).

38. As per claim 39, Tso et al teach wherein said filter is further adapted to filter input in a multi-channel mode (**column 8, lines 56-67**)..

39. As per claim 40, Tso et al teach wherein said filter is further adapted to filter input in a multi-modal mode (**column 8, lines 56-67**)..

40. As per claim 41, Tso et al teach wherein said filter is further adapted to filter input in a channel/modality independent mode (**column 8, lines 56-67**).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

41. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

42. Claims 10 and 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625) in view of "Access to Electronic Information by People with Disabilities", Michael G. Paciello (hereinafter Paciello), 1997, IEEE, pages 235-239.

43. As per claims 10 and 12, Tso et al fail to disclose a user of the at least one client device is one of seeing and hearing impaired.

44. However, Paciello teaches the production of electronic documents for people with disabilities such as is vision or hearing impaired (**page 235**) . It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Tso et al and Paciello et al because Paciello's use of electronic documents tailored to users with disabilities in Tso et al's system would allow a document model to be created specifically for a user with a disability by filtering out non-useful data and storing the document model for filtering future requested web pages so users with disabilities can receive documents that have been specially tailored to their needs.

45. Claims 21, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625) in view of Prager (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,999).

46. As per claim 21, Tso et al fail to disclose wherein the markup language is eXtensible Markup Language (XML) and the input DOM and filtered DOM are pseudo DOM's.

47. However, Prager et al teach that DOM is created automatically from documents, which can be XML (column 3, lines 30-45, column 3, line 65-column 4, line 5, and column 9, line 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Prager et al and Tso et al because Prager et al's use of a DOM that is created from XML document in Tso et al method would provide a model for documents which are preferred by Web developers and designers to create tags that offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information than is possible with the older HTML document coding system.

48. As per claim 38, Tso et al teach said filter is further adapted to filter the input DOM prior to transcoding the at least one page to at least one target presentation page in a multi-channel application or prior to transcoding the at least one page to at least one synchronized page (column 16, lines 20-46, and column 19, lines 40-59; filtering of objects, such as images, before scaling) in a multi-modal mode (column 8, lines 56-67).

49. Tso fails to teach the use of XML pages.

50. However, Prager et al teach that DOM is created automatically from documents, which can be XML (column 3, lines 30-45, column 3, line 65-column 4, line 5, and column 9, line

**30-40).** It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Prager et al and Tso et al because Prager et al's use of a DOM that is created from XML document in Tso et al method would provide a model for documents which are preferred by Web developers and designers to create tags that offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information than is possible with the older HTML document coding system.

51. Claims 36 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625) in view of Sorsa (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,945).

52. As per claim 36, Tso et al fail to teach a client device further comprises a speech synthesis system adapted to audibly reproduce an audio signal corresponding to the filtered DOM .

53. However, Sorsa teach the use of speech synthesis to allow people to browse the Internet using a voice browser (**column 1, lines 25-36 and abstract**). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Tso et al and Sorsa because Sorsa's use of speech synthesis in Tso et al's system would allow a document model to be created specifically for a user using voice to browse the internet by filtering out irrelevant data and storing the document model for filtering future requested web pages.

54. As per claim 42, Tso et al teach a system wherein the filtered DOM includes, Wireless Markup Language (WML) (**column 3, lines 50-60 and column 1, lines 41-55; wireless devices use WML**).

55. Tso et al fail to show at least one of speech, Voice eXtensible Markup Language (VoiceXML), and Conversational Markup Language (CML).

56. However, Sorsa teach the use of Voice eXtensible Markup Language (VoiceXML), SpeechML, and a speech processor in a voice browser, (**column 5, line 62-column 6, line 15**). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Tso et al and Sorsa because Sorsa's use of VoiceXML in Tso et al's system would allow a document model to be created specifically for a user using voice to browse the internet by filtering out irrelevant data and storing the document model for filtering future requested webpages.

### ***Response to Arguments***

57. Applicant's arguments filed August 19, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As an initial matter, Examiner points to page 1 of the remarks. Applicants had stated that they have amended, but it's not clear what has been amended. Clarification is requested.

- In the remarks, the Applicants argue in substance that:
  - A. the specification provides a standard for determining the meaning of "relevant" vs. "non-relevant" content and that claims 4-5, 11-12, and 35 are not indefinite. Applicant request withdrawal of 112 rejections.



B. Tso does not teach constructing a DOM, filtering the DOM to obtain a filtered DOM, a pre-specified rule being applied to the input DOM, and a filtered DOM.

- In response to:

Argument A:

In the remarks, the Applicants have attempted to explain the terms “relevant” and “non-relevant” as described in the specification, and insist that the specification defines these terms. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The specification does not clearly define what these terms are and does not limit what can be considered “relevant” or “non-relevant” content. The explanation provided in the remarks by the Applicants does not clearly explain what these terms are limited to. In the remarks, the Applicant explains that “non-relevant” content can be information *that has been previously displayed* and that “relevant” content can be *content that can be displayed*. This explanation would mean that “non-relevant” content could be included as “relevant” content since the information previously displayed was content that *can* be displayed on the device. Not limiting the scope of these definitions renders the claims indefinite since there isn’t a clear understanding on what can be included as “relevant” or “non-relevant” content. Therefore 112 rejections are maintained.

Argument B:

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Although Tso et al does not explicitly recite the exact terms as they are presented in the claims, the functionality of these limitations is taught by Tso et al. As it is well known in the art, various types of HTTP/HTML documents include document object models, which allow programs and scripts to dynamically access and update the content, structure and style of documents. The document can be further processed and the results of that

processing can be incorporated back into the presented page. Pages 7-8 of the Applicants's specification further proves that HTTP/HTML include document object models (DOM).

Therefore, Tso et al does teach constructing an input Document Object Model (DOM) based on a document corresponding to the request in column 8, lines 59-65, column 6, lines 22-45, column 11, lines 6-16; and column 12, lines 20-45. Documents are scaled to a model according to predetermined characteristics. Subsequent requests will be rendered in accordance with the set model. Tso et al also teach storing the input DOM in column 6, lines 46-53, column 8, lines 59-65, and column 16, lines 55-57. The remote scaling server includes a server-side cache memory that can be used to store the model. Tso et al further teach identifying elements of the input DOM that have previously been stored in Figures 8-10, column 9, lines 3-12, column 10, lines 45-59, and column 15, lines 1-30. The system determines if webpage or a hypertext object of a webpage already stored. Tso et al also teaches filtering the input DOM to obtain a filtered DOM, based on at least one pre-specified rule being applied to the input DOM in column 6, lines 23-52, column 19, lines 44-59, and column 4, lines 17-50. Content is selectively scaled based on predetermined characteristics. Tso et al meets the scope of the claim limitations, therefore rejection is maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramsey Refai  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2152

RR *RR*  
November 12, 2005

  
**BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**